

XII ARGUMENTS drawn out of the Scripture :

Wherein the commonly received Opinion touching the Deity
of the Holy Spirit, is clearly and fully refuted.

ARGUMENT I.

HE that is distinguished from
God, is not God. The
Holy Spirit is distinguished
from God. *Ergo.*

The *Major* is evident: for if he should be both God, and distinguished from God, he would be distinguished from himself; which implies a Contradiction. The *Minor* is confirmed by the whole current of the Scripture, which calleth him *the Spirit of God*, and saith that *he is sent by God*, and *searcheth the depths of God*, &c. Neither let any Man here think to fly to that ignorant Refuge of making a distinction between the Essence and Person of God, saying that the Holy Spirit is distinguished from God, taken Personally, not Essentially: For this wretched distinction (to omit the mention of the Primitive Fathers) is not only unheard of in Scripture, and so to be rejected, it being Presumption to affirm any thing of the unsearchable Nature of God, which he hath not first affirmed of himself in the Scripture; but is also disclaimed by Reason. For first, it is impossible for any Man, if he would but endeavour to conceive the thing, and not delude both himself and others with empty Terms, and Words without understanding, to distinguish the Person from the Essence of

God, and not to frame two Beings or Things in his Mind, and consequently two Gods. Secondly, If the Person be distinct from the Essence of God, then it must needs be *something*; since *nothing* hath no Accident, and therefore neither can it happen to it to be distinguished. If something, then either some finite or infinite thing: if finite, then there will be something finite in God, and consequently, since by the Confession of the Adversaries every thing in God is God himself, God will be Finite; which the Adversaries themselves will likewise confess to be absurd. If Infinite, then there will be two Infinites in God, to wit, the Person and Essence of God, and consequently two Gods; which is more absurd than the former. Thirdly, To talk of God taken impersonally, is ridiculous, not only because there is no Example thereof in Scripture, but because God is the Name of a * Person, and signifieth him that hath sublime Dominion or Power; and when it is put for the most High God, it denoteth him who with Sovereign and Absolute Authority ruleth over all; but none but a Person can rule over others, all Additions being proper to Persons; wherefore to take God otherwise than per-

B

* By Person, *Understand, as Philosophers do, Suppositum intelligens, that is an intellectual Substance complete, and not a Mood or Subsistence, which are fantastical and senseless Terms, brought in to cozen the simple.*
sonally,

sonally, is to take him otherwise than he is, and indeed to mistake him.

ARGUMENT II.

IF he that gave the Holy Spirit to the *Israelites* to instruct them, be Jehovah alone, then the Holy Spirit is not Jehovah or God. But he that gave the Holy Spirit to the *Israelites* to instruct them, is Jehovah alone. *Ergo*.

The Sequel of the *Major* is plain; for if he that gave the Holy Spirit be Jehovah alone, and yet the Holy Spirit that was given be Jehovah too, the same will be Jehovah alone, and not Jehovah alone, which implies a Contradiction. The *Minor* is evident by *Neh. 9. 6, 20.*

ARGUMENT III.

HE that speaketh not of himself, is not God. The Holy Spirit speaketh not of himself. *Ergo*.

The *Minor* is clear from *Joh. 16. 13.* The *Major* is proved thus: God speaketh of himself; therefore if there be any one that speaketh not of himself, he is not God. The Antecedent is of it self apparent; for God is the primary Author of whatsoever he doth; but should he not speak of himself, he must speak from another, and so not be the primary, but secondary Author of his Speech; which is absurd, if at least that may be called absurd, which is impossible. The Consequence is undeniable. For further Confirmation of this Argument, it is to be observed, that to speak or to do any thing not of himself, according to the ordinary Phrase of the Scripture, is to speak or do by the shewing, teaching, commanding, authorizing, or enabling of another, and consequently incompatible with the supreme and self-sufficient Majesty of God. *Vid. Joh. 5.*

19, 20, 30. *Joh. 7. 15, 16, 17, 18, 28. Joh. 8. 28, 42. Joh. 11. 50, 51. John 12. 49, 50. John 14. 10, 24. John 15. 4. John 18. 34. Luke 12. 56, 57. Luke 21. 30. 2 Cor. 3. 5.*

ARGUMENT IV.

HE that heareth from another what he shall speak, is not God. The Holy Spirit doth so. *Ergo*.

The *Minor* is plain from the fore-cited place, *Joh. 16. 13.* The *Major* is proved thus: He that is taught, is not God. He that heareth from another, what he shall speak, is taught. *Ergo*.

The *Major* is clear by *Isa. 40. 13, 14.* compared with *Rom. 11. 34. 1 Cor. 2. 16.* For these places of the Apostle, compared with that of the Prophet, shew that *Isaiah* did not by the Spirit of the Lord there understand the Holy Spirit, but the Mind, or Intention of God. The *Minor* is evidenced by *John 8.* where our Saviour having said in the 26th Verse, *Whatsoever I have heard from him (the Father) these things I speak;* in the 28th Verse he expresseth the same sense thus; *According as the Father hath taught me, these things I speak.* Neither let any Man go about to elude so pregnant an Argument, by saying that this is spoken of the Holy Spirit improperly: For let him turn himself every way, and screw the words as he pleases, yet shall he never be able to make it out to a wise and considering Man, how it can possibly be said, that any one heareth from another what he will speak, who is the prime Author of his Speech, and into whom it is not at a certain time insinuated by another. For this Expression plainly intimateth, that whatsoever the Holy Spirit speaketh to the Disciples, is first discovered and committed to him by Christ, whose Ambassador he is, it being proper to an Ambassador to be the Interpreter not of his own, but of another's Will. But it is contradictory to imagine that the most High God can have any thing discovered and committed to him by another.

ARGUMENT V.

HE that receiveth of anothers, is not God. The Holy Spirit doth so. *Ergo*.

The *Minor* is witnessed by the aforefaid place, *John* 16. 14. The *Major* is proved thus: God is he that giveth all things to all; wherefore if there be any one that receiveth of anothers, he cannot be God. The Antecedent is plain by *Acts* 17. 25. *Rom.* 11. 35, 36. The Consequence is undeniable: for if God should give all things to all, and yet receive of anothers, he would both give all things, and not give all things; have all things of his own, and have something of anothers; both which imply a Contradiction. The *Major* of the Prosyllogism is otherwise urged, thus: He that is dependent, is not God. He that receiveth of anothers is dependent: *Ergo*. The *Major* is unquestionable: for, to say one is dependent, and yet God, is in effect to say he is God, and not God, which implieth a Contradiction. The *Major* also is evident; for to receive of anothers, is the Notion of Dependency.

ARGUMENT VI.

HE that is sent by another, is not God. The Holy Spirit is sent by another. *Ergo*.

The *Minor* is plain from the fore-quoted place, *Joh.* 16. 7. The *Major* is evinced thus: He that ministreth, is not God. He that is sent, ministreth: *Ergo*.

The *Major* is indubitable, it being dissonant to the supream Majesty of God to minister, and serve another; for that were to be God and not God; to exercise Sovereign Dominion over all, and not to exercise it. The *Minor* is confirmed by *Heb.* 1. ult. where the Divine Author sheweth, that the Angels are all ministering Spirits, in that they are sent forth; as he before intimareth Christ to be Lord, because he sitteth at the Right-hand

Sovereignty of God, in saying that he sitteth in Heaven. The *Minor* is further proved thus:

He that receiveth a Command for the performance of something, doth minister:

He that is sent forth, receiveth a Command for the performance of something: *Ergo*.

The *Major* is evident to common Sense, since it sureth with none but Ministers and Inferiours to receive Commands. The *Minor* is manifested by *John* 12. 49. *The Father that hath sent me, he gave me a Command what I shall speak.* Neither let any Man here reply, that this very thing is spoken also of Christ, unless, having first proved that Christ is supream God, he will grant that whatsoever is spoken of him, is spoken of him as God; or can make good that to be sent at least may agree to him as God. The contrary whereof I suppose I have clearly proved in this Argument, shewing that it is unsuitable to the Divine Majesty.

ARGUMENT VII.

HE that is the Gift of God, is not God. The Holy Spirit is the Gift of God. *Ergo*.

The *Minor* is plain by *Acts* 12. 17. *Forasmuch then as God gave them the like Gift (meaning the Spirit) as he did unto us, who have believed on the Lord Jesus Christ, was I one that could withstand God?* The *Major*, though of it self sufficiently clear, is yet further evidenced thus:

He that is not the Giver of all things, is not God.

He that is the Gift of God, is not the Giver of all things: *Ergo*.

The *Major* is apparent from *Acts* 17. 25. *God giveth to all Life, Breath, and all things.* The *Minor* is proved thus:

He that is himself given, is not the Giver of all things:

He that is the Gift of God, is himself given: *Ergo*.

The *Major* is undeniable, for otherwise the same would be the Giver of all things,

and yet not the Giver of all things, inasmuch as he himself, a principal thing, is given, which implieth a Contradiction. The *Minor* needeth no Proof. Moreover, a Gift is in the Power, and at the disposal of the Giver; but it is gross and absurd to imagin that God can be in the Power, or at the disposal of another. Neither let any Man here think to evade, by saying, that not the Holy Spirit himself, but only his Gifts are imparted to Men; since both the more learned Adversaries themselves confess, that the Person of the Holy Spirit is given together with his Gifts, and the Scripture putteth the matter out of doubt, if you consult *Neh. 9. 20.* and *Rom. 5. 5.* In both which places, the Holy Spirit is said to be given contradistinctly from his Gifts and Operations: in the first, contradistinctly from the Instruction flowing from him; in the other, contradistinctly from the Love of God diffused in our Hearts by him. Whence we may draw this Corollary, That if the Person of the Holy Spirit be out of Favour given to certain Men, as the aforesaid places testify, then he was not personally present with them before, and consequently, by the Concession of the Adversaries themselves, cannot be God, since they will not deny that God is always personally present with all alike. But I forestal the following Argument.

ARGUMENT VIII.

HE that changeth place, is not God. The Holy Spirit changeth place. *Ergo.*

The *Major* is plain: for if God should change place, he would cease to be where he was before, and begin to be where he was not before; which everteth his Omnipresence, and consequently, by the Confession of the Adversaries themselves, his Deity.

The *Minor* is ocularly apparent, if following the * Advice of the Adversaries, you will but
 * *Abi, Ariane, ad Jordanem, & Trinitatem vide. his.*
 you shall have the Holy

Spirit in a bodily Shape descending from Heaven, which is the *terminus à quo*; and alighting upon Christ, which is the *terminus ad quem*, *Luk. 3. 21, 22.* *Joh. 1. 32.* Neither let any Man alledge, that as much is spoken of God, *Exod. 3.* and *Chap. 20.* and *Gen. 18.* For if you compare *Acts 7. 30, 35, 38, 53.* *Gal. 3. 19.* *Heb. 2. 2, 3.* and *Chap. 13. 2.* with the foresaid places, you shall find, that it was not God himself that came down, but only an Angel, sustaining the Person and Name of God; which hath no place in the History touching the descent of the Holy Spirit.

ARGUMENT IX.

HE that prayeth unto Christ, to come to Judgment, is not God. The Holy Spirit doth so. *Ergo.*

The *Major* is granted. The *Minor* is evident from *Revel. 22. 17.* compared with the 12th Verse. Neither let any Man think to elude this Proof, by saying, that the Spirit is here said to pray, only because he maketh the Bride to pray: for when the Scripture would signify the Assistance of the Holy Spirit in causing Men to speak, it is wont to affirm, either that the Holy Spirit speaketh in them, as *Mat. 10. 20.* or that they spake by the Holy Spirit, as *Rom. 8. 15.* We have received the Spirit of Adoption, by whom we cry, *Abba, Father.* But here it is expressly said, that the Spirit and the Bride say, *Come*; nor the Spirit in the Bride, nor the Bride by the Spirit.

ARGUMENT X.

HE in whom Men have not believed, and yet have been Disciples and Believers, is not God. Men have not believed in the Holy Spirit, and yet have been so. *Ergo.*

The *Major* is plain: for how can they be Disciples and Believers, according to the

him that is God? The *Minor* is proved thus: Men have not so much as heard whether there were an Holy Spirit, and yet have been Disciples and Believers: *Ergo*. They have not believed in the Holy Spirit, and yet have been Disciples and Believers.

The Antecedent is apparent from *Acts* 19. 2. The Consequence is grounded on that of the Apostle, *Rom.* 10. 14. [*How shall they believe in him, of whom they have not heard?*] Now if any Man, to decline the dint of this Argument, shall say, that by Holy Spirit in these words [*Ἄλλ' ἔσθ' εἰ πνεῦμα ἄγιον ἐστὶν ἡκούσθου*] is meant not the Person, but the Gifts of the Holy Spirit. He, besides that he perverteth the plain and genuine meaning

of the words, and speaketh without Example*; doth also evacuate the Emphasis of the Particles *ἄλλ' ἔσθ'*, which imply that these Disciples were so far from having received the Gifts of the Holy Spirit, whereof we may without Prejudice to our Cause, grant

that the Question made mention, that they had not so much as heard whether there were an holy Spirit or not. Again, that the holy Spirit is not God, doth further appear by this very Instance, since the Apostle, when there was so ample an occasion offered to declare it (if it had been so) doth quite decline it: for it is incredible that he, who was so intent and vigilant in propagating the Truth, as that casually seeing an Altar at *Athens* inscribed, *To the unknown God*, he presently took a hint from thence, to preach unto the Heathen the true God; yet here being told by Disciples that they had not so much as heard whether there were an holy Spirit, or not, should not make use of the opportunity to discover unto them, and in them to us, the Deity of the holy Spirit, but suffer them to remain in Ignorance touching a Point of such consequence, that without the knowledg thereof (if we believe many now a-days) Men cannot be saved. Certainly, the Apostle had a greater care both

of the Truth of God, and the Salvation of Men, than to do so.

ARGUMENT XI.

HE that hath an Understanding distinct from that of God, is not God. The Holy Spirit hath an Understanding distinct from that of God. *Ergo*.

The *Major* is clear: for he that hath an Understanding distinct from that of another, must needs likewise have a distinct Essence, wherein that Understanding may reside. The *Major* is proved thus: He that heareth from God at the second hand, namely, by Christ Jesus, what he shall speak, hath an Understanding distinct from that of God. The Holy Spirit so heareth from God: *Ergo*.

The *Minor* is evident from *Joh.* 16. 13, 14, 15. The *Major* is confirmed thus: He that is taught of God, hath an Understanding distinct from that of God. He that heareth from God what he shall speak, is taught of God: *Ergo*.

The *Minor* is manifest from *Joh.* 8. where our Saviour Christ having said in Verse 26. *Whatsoever I have heard from him (the Father) these things I speak.* In Verse 28. he expresseth the same sense thus: [*According as the Father hath taught me, these things I speak.*] The *Major* is of it self clear: for he that is taught, hath an unknowing Understanding, since none can be taught what he knoweth already; and he that teacheth, hath a knowing Understanding, otherwise he could not teach another something; but it implieth a Contradiction, that the same Understanding should at the same time be both knowing and unknowing of the same thing. Besides, that the Holy Spirit hath an Understanding distinct from that of God, is easily deducible from the words of the Apostle, *1 Cor.* 2. 10. where he affirmeth, *that the Spirit searcheth the depths of God (as Rom. 8. 27. he intimateth, that God searcheth the Heart of the Spirit:)* but to search the depths of any one, necessarily

rily supposeth one understanding in him that searcheth, and another understanding in him whose Depths are searched, as is evident, not only by collation of other places of the Scripture, as 1 *Pet.* 1. 11. *Rev.* 2. 23. but even by common sense, dictating to every Man so much, that none can, without absurdity, be said to search the depths of his own understanding. Whence the Apostle going about to illustrate what he had spoken of the Spirit of God, by a similitude drawn from the Spirit of a Man, doth not say, that the Spirit of a Man doth *search*, but know the things of a Man, though his former words did seem to lead him thereunto.

ARGUMENT XII.

HE that hath a Will distinct in number from that of God, is not God. The Holy Spirit hath a Will distinct in number from that of God. *Ergo.*

The *Major* is irrefragable. The *Minor* is asserted thus.

He that willeth conformably to the Will of God, hath a Will distinct in number from that of God.

The Holy Spirit so willeth : *Ergo.*

The *Major* is plain ; for conformity must be between twain at least, else it will not be Conformity, but Identity. The *Minor* is confirmed by *Rom.* 8. 26, 27. *Likewise the Spirit also helpeth our Infirmities ; for we know not what to pray for as we ought, but the Spirit himself maketh intercession for us, with groans unutterable : But he that searcheth the Hearts, knoweth the Mind of the Spirit ; for he maketh intercession for the Saints, according to the Will of God.* Neither let any Man here reply, that there is no mention made in the Greek, either of the Will of the Spirit, or of the Will of God : For, first, the word *intercede*, which signifieth to make suit for something, implieth both the Will of him that maketh the Suit, for if he did not will the thing, he would not make suit for it ; and also the Will of him to whom the Suit is made ; for were he

not endued with a Will, it would be bootless to make suit unto him, all Suits whatsoever being made to bend the Will of him to whom they are made : So that this, without any more, sufficiently sheweth that the Holy Spirit hath a Will distinct in number from that of God ; since the one sueth, the other is sued at the same time, and for the same thing. Secondly, the word *εὐχόμενος*, in English rendred *Mind*, doth here signify the same with Will or Desire, as appeareth from the 6th and 7th Verses of this Chapter ; and also from the Verb *εὐχόμενος*, whence it is derived, which signifieth to *Affect, Will, Desire, Pursue* ; see Verse 5. of the same Chapter, and *Col.* 3. 2. Thirdly, Though the Greek hath *καὶ ὁ Θεὸς, according to God* ; yet is this, in the judgment of the English Translators themselves, the same as if it had been said, *καὶ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ, according to the Will of God* ; neither can any other commodious Interpretation be put upon the words.

But this Passage of the Apostle, doth further afford us a second and third impregnable Argument of the Holy Spirit's being inferior to God. For, first, he is here said to *make intercession for us*, (as we before urged his praying to Christ, *Argument 9.*) and that *with groans unutterable* ; which is not so to be understood, as if the Holy Spirit were here said to help our Infirmities, only by suggesting Petitions and Groans unto us, (as is commonly, but *falsely* affirmed) for the very words of the Context sufficiently exclude such a gloss ; since they say, *that the Spirit himself, not we by the Spirit*, (as we have it in the 15th Verse of the same Chapter) *maketh intercession for us* ; yea, *vicarious intercession*, as the Greek word *καὶ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν* signifieth : But to help others Infirmities, by *making intercession* ; and, what is more, *vicarious intercession for them*, is not to instil Petitions into them, but to pour out Petitions apart in their behalf ; as is apparent both from the thing it self ; since none can intercede for himself, all Intercession (at least such as is here spoken of) requiring the entermise of a third Person ; and by the Collation of Verse 34 of the same Chapter, and 1 *Tim.* 2. 1. *2nd.*

Heb. 7. 25. Neither let any Man think to baffle off this place, (which is written with a Beam of the Sun, and hath, together with that *John 16. 13, 14.* quite nonpluss'd, not only Modern Authors, but the Fathers themselves) by saying, that this is improperly spoken of the Holy Spirit: For, besides, that he hath no other ground to say so, but his own pre-conceived Opinion touching the Deity of the Holy Spirit, he ought to know that the Scripture, though it speaketh some things of God in a Figure, and improperly; yet doth it no where say any thing that argueth his Inferiority to, and dependance on another. But this Passage of the Apostle plainly intimareth, that the Holy Spirit is inferior to God, and dependent on him; otherwise what need had he to make intercession to God, and that with groans unutterable, for the Saints? Secondly, The Holy Spirit is here distinguished from *him that searcheth the Hearts*; and this Description is made use of to put a difference between God and the Holy Spirit: But how could this be done, were the Holy Spirit also a searcher of the Hearts? For can a Description that is common, yea alike common to twain, (for so the Adversaries hold concerning God, and the Holy Spirit) be set to distinguish the one from the other? For instance; *to prepare the Passover for Christ*, is an Action common to Peter with John, for they twain were sent by Christ to that purpose, and did accordingly

perform it; see *Luke 22. 8, 13.* Wherefore can a Description taken from this Action, be fit to difference Peter from John? And is it suitable to say, *He that prepared the Passover for Christ, was a greater Apostle than John*? Would not this plainly argue, that John did not prepare the Passover for Christ? So that it is apparent, that the Holy Spirit is not a searcher of the Hearts. If therefore, it would not follow that the Holy Spirit is God, although it had been said in the Scripture, that he searcheth the Hearts, unless he had such a faculty originally, and of himself, (for nothing hinders but that God may confer it upon others, as we see by the Scripture, that he hath, *de facto*, conferred it on Christ, having given him all Judgment, and that, because he is the Son of Man, *John 5. 22, 27.* for such Judgment requireth that he be a searcher of the Hearts); If, I say, it would not even then follow that he is God; how clearly, how irrefragably doth it on the contrary follow, that he is not God, but hath an understanding distinct from, and inferior to that of God; in as much as he is destitute of such a perfection, as the searching of the Hearts, which is inseparable from the Divine Majesty? These two Considerations have I added at the close of my twelfth Argument, because they are not so much new Arguments, as Props and further Confirmations of the Ninth and Eleventh Arguments.